



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116 TO THE DECEMBER 12, 2005 OFFICE ACTION

APPLICANTS: Deuringer et al.

GROUP ART UNIT: 2882

SERIAL NO.: 10/813,773

EXAMINER: Jurie Yun

FILED: March 31, 2004

CONFIRMATION NO.: 5205

TITLE: "APPARATUS FOR GENERATING X-RAYS"

**MAIL STOP AF**

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

*O.K. to enter  
J.Y.*

SIR:

Applicants and their counsel have carefully reviewed the Office Action dated December 12, 2005, but believe the claims in their present form are patentable over the references relied upon by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the application in view of the following arguments in support of patentability is therefore respectfully requested.

**R E M A R K S**

In the Office Action dated December 12, 2005, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph because the Examiner stated the terms "for use with" and "adapted for" recite intended use and do not convey any structural limitations. Applicants are well aware of the non-limiting meaning of these terms, which is precisely why they were used in claim 1. The use of the term "adapted for" is the generally accepted way of describing an environment of the claimed subject matter, in order to provide antecedent basis for a later reference in the same claim, but without including the material following the "adapted for" phrase as a part of the affirmatively claimed subject matter. For example, the term "adapted for" is